

Dear Oliver

As I won't be there for the discussion on Monday, I wanted to share with you the French comments on this new version of the core implementation report. My colleague Gemma will be there on Monday and will be able to share these comments with the plenary.

First, I would like to congratulate you for the document which is really good. We have only few comments on 4 paragraphs (9, 14, 16 and 32) as you can see in the note attached to my email, but they are important for us.

In addition, to answer the points of discussion raised by the USA on the HLPE, here is our position:

1 / Should only HLPE reports feed the political processes of the CFS?

- Yes it is the very essence of the HLPE, that was created for that; it is a dedicated panel and its reports are the only ones to be independent (the other studies generally have a bias) and they take into account the positions of the different existing studies. This role is clearly explained in the CFS reform document.

2 / Should ALL HLPE reports automatically lead to the development of policy guidelines?

- Yes because there will be only one per year. In addition, HLPE products respond in principle to CFS commands (on critical and emerging topics) according to the political priorities that will be discussed in its framework. The choice of reports depends on MyPOW and therefore on the needs of the stakeholders and it is therefore logical to do something with. Conversely, policy guidelines non based on HLPE reports should be limited.

3 / Should the Member States be called upon to actively disseminate HLPE reports in the same way as the resulting political directives at national level?

- We are very attached to the fact that the contents of the reports are widely disseminated because of their richness to reveal first reflections on the political recommendations that could result from them. So yes, the reports (or their executive summaries) must be actively disseminated. This contributes, among other things, to the visibility of the HLPE and the CFS at the national level.

Best regards and thanks again for all the work you have done.

Delphine

9. For the next MYPoW, CFS will focus its resources on performing Roles 1 (coordination at global level) and 2 (policy convergence) in a more demand-driven way and with greater efficiency and effectiveness as well as the lessons sharing part of Role 5 (promoting accountability and best practices) and Role 6 (Global Strategic Framework). Roles 3 (support and advise to countries), 4 (coordination at national and regional level) and the accountability part of Role 5 were mostly beyond the direct control of CFS as a Rome-based Committee and relied on government initiatives in partnerships with RBAs, other UN bodies and other stakeholders that have an implementation and coordination role at national and regional levels.

14. The new MYPoW preparation process will lead to a more effective prioritization of CFS thematic activities, with expected reduction of resource needs and workload, with the enforcement of the decision that the inclusion of new activities in MYPoW will be subject to concrete indications of the volume of planned activities. The new process will also contribute to strengthening ownership and commitment of CFS stakeholders in implementing the results of CFS policy work as well as optimizing the use of HLPE inputs to support CFS thematic workstreams.

16. The CFS Bureau, in consultation with the Advisory Group, will be more directly involved in the finalization of the draft MYPoW, which will be prepared through an inclusive process, to be presented to the CFS Plenary for consideration, possible adjustments and endorsement.

32. CFS will also promote accountability and share best practices at all levels, including through: follow-up and review of both global and country/region specific FSN situations, trends, progress, challenges and sharing lessons; assessing the effectiveness of CFS and follow-up and review of the use and application of its policy guidelines and recommendations; and facilitating advice regarding recommended approaches to country/regional review and follow-up of FSN objectives. CFS will continue to hold Global Thematic Events in Plenary every 2 years and to encourage stakeholders to organize national and regional events to support Global Thematic Events.

**Commented [BD1]:** No. In the reform document in para 6i, it is said :  
*"One guiding principle to support this role will be to build on and strengthen existing structures and linkages with key partners at all levels. In each case, the functional contributions they could make, as well as how the CFS could strengthen linkages and enhance synergy with such partners would have to be established"*  
**Consequently, the CFS at global level has to play an active role on these aspects**

**Commented [BD2]:** Decision to include activities in the MYPoW can't be subject to resource availability as the MYPoW is developed for 4 years and CFS members have not a 4 years 'visibility on their available funding.

**Commented [BD3]:** Not clear. How this inclusive process will be conducted? In plenary or in an OEWG? By email consultation? Should be specified.

**Commented [BD4]:** Too vague. We don't know who is « CFS »

**Commented [BD5]:** How ? We have not moved forward since the reform. On accountability, the reform document (6.ii) says this:  
*The CFS should help countries and regions, as appropriate, address the questions of whether objectives are being achieved and how food insecurity and malnutrition can be reduced more quickly and effectively. This will entail developing an innovative mechanism, including the definition of common indicators, to monitor progress towards these agreed upon objectives and actions taking into account lessons learned from previous CFS and other monitoring attempts. Comments by all CFS stakeholders will have to be taken into account and new mechanisms will build on existing structures.*